

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/872,938	LYNCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leslie Wong	2164	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Leslie Wong. (3)_____

(2) Thomas S. Ferrill. (4)_____

Date of Interview: May 15& June 11,07.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 29, and 39.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wheeler and Chakrabarti.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☒ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


LESLIE WONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

May 15, 2007

Applicant's representative described the invention and discussed rejected claims and cited prior art. The representative emphasized on the features of the claimed invention: searching on the abstract or representation of the document and generating a list or related document ranked based upon relevance of ... FIRST FIELD (i.e., this is an actual XML field which the system has mapped from the content query document). The first representation includes a set of terms and one or more weighted values associated with EACH term (i.e., not an overall ranking of the related document)... in the reference XML document. Furthermore, the claimed invention generating a link for each of the one or more related documents ... the links points to a RELEVANT FIELD(s) within its related documents.

Applicant's representative further discussed how proposed amended claims overcome the prior art of record. Examiner thought that the proposed amended claims appear to overcome the cited prior art. However, the amendment would likely raise new issues that would required further consideration and/or search. Applicants may further define the limitations of the claims by including the mapping between the content document and the actual fields of xml document.

June 11, 2007

Next, the 101 issues were discussed. Examiner indicated that claim 24 is for an apparatus with the means for function, the claim appears to contain all software means, it does not have hardware to enable the functionality to be realized. Examiner requested the representative to point to Specification for disclosure which contain hardware support for the claim. The representative pointed to Fig. 1, element 110, reference Document Input, element 112 Field Input, and element 102, Engine, he asserted that without hardware the system would not be able to communicate and transfer information to the search engine. Examiner stated it could be all software that processes the input field. Claim 24 was consulted with the workgroup advisor, claim 24 appears to be statutory.